

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

**JULIAN ARI SHULMAN,**

Plaintiff,

**-vs-**

**Case No. 12-C-392**

**AMAZON.COM, Inc., SUSAN ARNETT,  
KIRSTEN MITCHELL, JOHN DOES I-XXV,**

Defendants.

---

**DECISION AND ORDER**

---

The plaintiff, Julian Shulman, moves for an extension of time to file an appeal from the Court's dismissal of this action for lack of personal jurisdiction. Such a motion can be granted only if the movant shows excusable neglect or good cause. Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5)(A)(ii). Shulman, a *pro se* litigant, provides a laundry list of excuses, most of which are related to his ignorance or purported confusion over the proper interpretation of the federal civil and appellate rules of procedure. *Pro se* litigants are entitled to a liberal construction of their pleadings, but they are not "excused from compliance with procedural rules." *Pearle Vision, Inc. v. Romm*, 541 F.3d 751, 758 (7th Cir. 2008). Moreover, Shulman's motion reflects a strange ambivalence about whether he actually wants to file a notice of appeal. This suggests that Shulman simply wants more time to think about appealing. Procedural deadlines cannot be ignored for the benefit of waffling litigants. Indecision does not establish good cause or excusable neglect. *McCarty v. Astrue*, 528 F.3d 541, 544 (7th Cir. 2008) (courts examine the reason for the delay, i.e., whether it was within

the reasonable control of the movant) (citing *Pioneer Inv. Serv. Co. v. Brunswick Assocs.*, 507 U.S. 380, 395 (1993)).

Shulman's motion to extend the time to appeal [ECF No. 24] is **DENIED**. His remaining motions [ECF Nos. 21, 32] are also **DENIED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 4th day of October, 2012.

BY THE COURT:



HON. RUDOLPH T. RANDA  
U.S. District Judge